



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,427	04/30/2001	Robert Raymond	10992434-1	3413

7590 02/27/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

GOLINKOFF, JORDAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

5

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/845,427

Applicant(s)

RAYMOND, ROBERT

Examiner

Jordan S Golinkoff

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1, 9, and 24 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Claim 1, line 1 – “displaying customer-based” should be changed to “displaying a customer-based”
 - Claims 9 and 24, line 2 – “depth breadth and arrangement” should be changed to “depth, breadth, and arrangement”
 - Claims 11 and 25, line 4 – “..” should be changed to “.” at the end of the sentence.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 3, 5, 7-13, 16-18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claim 3 recites the limitation "said referenced data miners" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
5. Claim 5 recites the limitation "said portal view profile manager" in line 2. Claim 5 also recites the limitation "said portal view profiles" in lines 3-4. Claim 5 also recites the limitation "said data miner module" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2174

6. Claim 7 recites the limitation "said portal view profile" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. Claim 8 recites the limitation "said data miners" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
8. Claim 9 recites the limitation "said portal view profile" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
9. Claim 10 recites the limitation "said portal view profile manager" in line 1. Claim 10 also recites the limitation "said portal view profiles" in lines 3-4 and 6. Claim 10 also recites the limitation "said references to a data miner" in line 7. Claim 10 also recites the limitation "said portal view profile selector" in line 7. Claim 10 also recites the limitation "said referenced data miner" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
10. Claim 11 recites the limitation "said portal view profile" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
11. Claim 12 recites the limitation "said portal view profile" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
12. Claim 13 recites the limitation "said portal view profile selector" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
13. Claim 16 recites the limitation "said series of windows" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
14. Claim 17 recites the limitation "said portal view edit manager" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2174

15. Claim 18 recites the limitation "said data miners referenced" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

16. Claim 22 recites the limitation "said referenced data miners" and "said data miners" in lines 3-4, and 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

17. Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangarajan et al. ("Rangarajan," US006275225B1).

As per independent claim 1, Rangarajan teaches a service information portal for displaying customer-based portal view display of networked computing environments (column 4, lines 50-55), wherein said portal view display includes management information of a type, depth and breadth specified by an end-user in a format and arrangement also specified by the end-user (column 4, lines 59-64).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Rangarajan teaches that the service information portal comprises: a portal view profile manager that provides a portal view profile associated with the end user, wherein said portal view profile is configured and causing generation of a customized portal view display (column 8, lines 10-19); and a portal view display manager that executes said portal view profile to generate said customized portal view display (column 8, lines 10-14).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Rangarajan teaches that the service information portal further comprises: a portal view edit manager that enables the end user to interact with said referenced data miners to modify portions of said portal view profile that reference said data miners (column 8, lines 13-15 and column 7, lines 8-14, *profiles create queries that access data about chosen network devices*).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Rangarajan teaches that the service information portal further comprises: a help display manager that displays help files in response to an end user's request (column 9, lines 52-54).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 4, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view profile is an extensible, executable software program that invokes a pre-determined combination of data miners (column 7, lines 8-14) that generate or cause the generation of management information to assist the user manage the computing environment (column 9, lines 59-65).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view profile comprises sheet display specifications defining one or more sheets of management information, said sheets displayed alternatively (figure 9), wherein said sheet display configuration includes specifications defining one or more columns within each said one or more sheets, wherein said column specifications including one or more data miner references, wherein each portal module reference includes portal module configuration parameters that provide attribute settings to the referenced portal view module when it is invoked (figure 9, *2 columns of information are shown with detailed information*).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 3, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view edit manager enables the end user to modify said data miners referenced in said portal view profile (column 9, lines 41-46).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 2, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view display manager displays a detailed portal view display of a selected one of said series of windows in response to a request by the end user (column 10, lines 1-6 and column 9, lines 54-58, *more than one window to display information*).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 2, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view edit manager provides the end user with the ability to modify said portal view profile (column 9, lines 41-45).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view profile manager comprises a database of executable portal view profiles each designed for and/or by a particular end-user (column 9, lines 12-14), wherein each said portal view profiles includes a reference to one or more selected data miners included in a library of a plurality of data miners (column 7, lines 8-14), and wherein said portal view display manager executes one of said portal view profiles and the data miners referenced therein, wherein each said data miner module extracts data from predetermined entities in the computing environment for generating data and derives said management information therefrom (column 9, lines 49-52 and 59-65).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 5, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view profile manager further comprises: a repository of mapping data that associates each end-user and one of said portal view profiles (column 9, lines 12-14); and a profile selector that, based on said end-user, retrieves from said repository one of said portal view profiles that is to be

Art Unit: 2174

implemented for said selected end-user (column 9, lines 49-52), wherein, for each of said references to a data miner, said portal view profile selector verifies that said reference has a syntax appropriate for said referenced data miner (column 9, lines 49-52 and lines 59-61).

Although Rangarajan does not explicitly state verifying syntax to run a data miner, he does teach checking for errors and validating a user profile setup to insure correct configuration and execution of a profile and associated network data miners (column 6, lines 39-45)

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view profile selector further accesses a database of portal view specification files, each said portal view specification file defining a grammar that is to be used in a portal view profile in connection with a corresponding portal view module (column 9, lines 17-30). Although Rangarajan does not explicitly state that a particular grammar is stored to activate a portal view, it is inherent that grammar for components to interact be provided to allow portal view profiles to correctly call data needed to manage information.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view display is generated automatically with no end-user action beyond logging into the service information portal (column 5, lines 5-23).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Rangarajan teaches that the computing environment includes domain managers accessed by said data miners, wherein said domain managers comprise one or more of the group consisting of: network managers that manage individual and collections of networks (column 6, lines 24-31); software application managers that manage software applications executing on a node or server of the computing environment; database managers that manage databases executing on a node or server of the network system;

Art Unit: 2174

and server managers that assist a network administrator manage the operations of each server in a network (column 6, lines 24-31).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view display format, depth breadth and arrangement are determined by attributes included in said portal view profile (column 7, lines 45-47).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 1, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view display includes a series of windows each allocated to the display of management information provided by a particular data miner (column 10, lines 1-6 and column 9, lines 54-58, *the use of multiple windows to display management information*).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 1, Rangarajan teaches that a portal view profile manager comprises: a database of executable portal view profiles each designed for and/or by a particular end-user (column 9, lines 12-14), wherein each said portal view profiles includes a reference to one or more selected data miners included in a library of a plurality of data miners (column 7, lines 8-14); and wherein said portal view display manager executes one of said portal view profiles and the data miners referenced therein, wherein each said data miner module extracts data from predetermined entities in the computing environment for generating data and derives said management information therefrom (column 9, lines 49-52 and 59-61).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 23, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view display format, depth breadth and arrangement are determined by attributes included in said portal view profile (column 7, lines 45-47).

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 23, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view profile is an extensible, executable software program that invokes a pre-determined combination

Art Unit: 2174

of data miners (column 7, lines 8-14) that generate or cause the generation of management information to assist the user manage the computing environment (column 9, lines 59-65).

As per independent claim 19, Rangarajan teaches a service information portal for providing a network administrator with a customizable, extensible portal view display of management information reflective of a desired aspect of a computing environment (column 4, lines 50-64).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 19, Rangarajan teaches that the portal view display includes management information of a type, depth and breadth specified by the network administrator in a format and arrangement also specified by the network administrator through a graphical user interface (column 7, lines 45-47).

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 20, Rangarajan teaches that the service information portal comprises: a portal view profile manager that provides a portal view profile associated with the end user, wherein said portal view profile is configured and causing generation of a customized portal view display (column 8, lines 10-19); and a portal view display manager that executes said portal view profile to generate said customized portal view display (column 8, lines 10-14).

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 21, Rangarajan teaches that the service information portal further comprises: a portal view edit manager that enables the end user to interact with said referenced data miners to modify portions of said portal view profile that reference said data miners to cause said data miners (column 8, lines 13-15 and column 7, lines 8-14, *profiles create queries that access data about chosen network devices*).

Art Unit: 2174

As per independent claim 26, Rangarajan teaches a method for displaying a portal view display of management information relevant to a particular end user and computing environment, comprising: A) receiving an identifier of the end user (column 5, lines 10-14); B) generating management information specified by the end user, said management information directed only to a portion of the computing environment for which said end user is authorized to manage (column 5, lines 10-14); and C) displaying said management information on a display device in a format, arrangement specified by the end user (column 7, lines 45-47).

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 26, Rangarajan teaches that the management information comprises: 1) providing a database of data miner modules, each said data miner module generating or causing the generation of management information related to a particular network entity or function (column 4, lines 59-67, *i.e. – storing data about network devices in a database*); 2) generating a database of portal view profiles each referencing a predetermined one or more data miner modules to display management information pertinent to a particular end user (column 5, lines 35-45, *i.e. – load from a database*, and column 9, lines 21-29); 3) retrieving from said database of portal view profiles a portal view profile associated with said end user (column 5, lines 35-45); and 4) invoking said retrieved portal view profile and said one or more data miner modules referenced therein (column 9, lines 21-29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2174

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 7 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangarajan et al. ("Rangarajan," US006275225B1).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of Rangarajan in regards to claim 1 have been discussed above. Rangarajan does not disclose that the portal view profile is associated with a group of end-users including said end-user.

Official Notice is given that the use of groups of users to define access privileges or display characteristics for a set of users is notoriously well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Rangarajan with a means to associate a group of end-users with a portal view profile with the motivation to reduce individual portal setup and instead provide for a common portal profile for a set of common users.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, the teachings of Rangarajan in regards to claim 13 have been discussed above. Rangarajan does not disclose that the portal view profile specification is a document type descriptor (.dtd) file and wherein said portal view profile is an XML file.

Official notice is given that storing profiles in an XML format is well known in the art. Furthermore, the use of .dtd files in relation to XML, SGML, or HTML files is also notoriously well-known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Rangarajan with a means to store profiles as XML files where profile specifications are .dtd files with the motivation to allow a simpler and more extensible method to encode and store profile data.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dev et al. (US005295244A), Nagai et al. (US005483631A), Jain et al. (US006040834A), Battat et al. (US005958012A), and Reddy et al. (US 20020091753A1) all describe a user-customizable method to manage networks.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jordan S Golinkoff whose telephone number is 703-305-8771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jordan Golinkoff
Patent Examiner
February 12, 2004

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100